

**EPA Air Toxics Pilot Working Group**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**June 27, 2001**

**Members Attending:** Anjali Mathur, Kevin Snape, Glenn Landers, Mary Smith, Bill Skowronski, Michael Krzywicki, Tim Nieberbing, Rev. Maurice Hockett, Laura Hobson, Mandie Domanovic, Jacquie Gillon, Paige Akins, Jerome Walcott, Kyle Dreyfuss-Wells, Stephanie Mohr, Amy Simpson, Elizabeth Shaw, Dennis Finn, Mike Suver, Bob Leidich, Bill Davis, Maribeth Feke.

**Facilitators:** Patrick Field, Allison Berland.

**Members Absent:** Stuart Greenberg, Amy Ryder, Rev. Marvin Smith, Ron Kunkle, Joseph Calabrese.

The Ohio Air Toxics Working Group convened for the first time. The Environmental Protection Agency welcomed members, provided an introduction to the Cleveland Air Toxics Pilot (see EPA handout), and introduced the facilitators. The facilitators reviewed the agenda and noted that they would be taking meeting notes and preparing this meeting summary.

**Action Items:** See attached action items from the meeting.

**Overview of the Cleveland Air Toxics Pilot Project**

Mary Smith, provided an overview of the Pilot including project goals, and history, and overall plan for moving forward.

Air toxics are outdoor or indoor pollutants that are known or suspected to cause cancer or other serious health effects, or adverse environmental effects. Under the Clean Air Act, there are 188 stationary air toxics of concern and 21 mobile air toxics of concern.

EPA's Integrated Urban Air Toxics Strategy (IUATS) has created rules for over 80 categories of major stationary sources and for controlling emissions from vehicles and fuels. IUATS proposes to seek better data and more research on air toxics, work with communities to address local needs and improve outreach.

Cleveland was chosen for this Air Toxics Pilot because it is a typical American city. The hope is that this pilot can be transferable in other communities. Through this process, communities can get involved in addressing air toxics issues in a sustainable way, by focusing on those issues of greatest local concern. The Pilot can address outdoor and indoor sources of air toxics, and achieve reductions earlier than Federal regulation. EPA's role in the pilot will be as a partner, funder, and to provide support through facilitation, communication and technical resources.

## **Introductions**

The facilitators, CBI Vice President Patrick Field and Associate Allison Berland, introduced themselves, reviewed the agenda and groundrules for the night. The facilitator's role in the pilot will be to:

- Facilitate good meetings and good communication.
- Help the working group keep on track.
- Assist in building Working Group consensus.
- Prepare meeting summaries and track action items.

Each member provided a short introduction. See attached the list of members and their affiliation.

## **Questions About the Air Toxics Pilot**

Members had the opportunity to ask questions about the pilot. The following is a list of questions that were asked:

1. What motivated the EPA to focus on air toxics reduction strategy?

EPA: The Clean Air Act provided for a Clean Air Strategy (IUATS). The pilot was recommended in this strategy.

2. Why isn't the EPA pursuing enforcement?

EPA: The EPA intends to move out on regulations as well. We are also interested in what we can do on a community level above and beyond regulations -- what can you do with polluting vehicles, citizen habits, etc. In addition, some regulations will not be in place for some time, so taking action now where possible is important to address current issues quickly.

3. Will we be addressing the health affects of air toxics, especially asthma?

EPA: Yes. In regards to asthma specifically, it is not typically linked to air toxics. Current science has not yet provided clear linkages air toxics and asthma. However, some of the actions we may undertake as a group may not only reduce air toxics, but also help reduce other air emissions that are known to affect those with asthma..

4. What is considered success?

EPA: The working group is a success if stakeholders consider it to be a success. There should be lots of action in terms of reduction, replicability in other communities, and the process is sustainable. The group will have a chance to further define success as we go along.

Member: Identify a number of projects to reduce air toxics that the community could do, develop a work plan, implement it. People should feel good about it.

Member: Quantify risk reductions, “reduce X reductions by Y amount.” We want to reduce toxic emissions and quantify those reductions.

Member: Identify best management practices. This is better and easier than quantifying reductions.

Member: This group would become very educated about air toxics and we should also educate ourselves on our communities’ concerns.

Member: We should focus on simple analysis for quantifying reductions.

Member: If we could identify a project that we could replicate in our communities or citywide, that would be success.

Member: Identifying which companies are most problematic and finding out their sources (of air toxics) and reducing those emissions.

Member: Small businesses don’t have time to do an in-depth analysis of air toxics. But, we could provide incentives to help them make improvements.

5. How do we evaluate strategies? How do we make decisions, choosing this kind of project over that project?

Member: This goes back to the quantification question. It is a “bang for your buck” question.

Member: We need a methodology that in the end we can quantify the benefits of one project versus another project.

6. What if we find out if the problem is a lack of enforcement?

Member: Agency will do our best to enforce the rules and regulations we have.

7. What are the resources this working group has to work with?

EPA: The EPA has \$600,000 to implement projects for this pilot along with technical resources from the staff.

## **Groundrules**

Members reviewed the draft groundrules for the working group. There was discussion about how the working group should handle the media, consensus decisionmaking, and absent members and

decisionmaking. The facilitators agreed to incorporate the suggested changes/ideas into the groundrules and to issue a revised version before the next meeting.

### **Membership**

Members discussed if there were others who should be included in the working group. Suggestions included a labor representative, a Department of Public Health representative also working in on indoor air issues, and other industries. The facilitators agreed to compile a list of suggestions from the working group, research these suggestions, and provide information about possible additional member to the working group at the next meeting.

### **Housekeeping, Next Meeting and Adjournment**

Five individuals volunteered for an agenda-planning group for the summer agendas. The facilitators and this planning group will hold a conference call meeting to plan the next meeting. The tentative next meeting dates are July 23, July 24, July 30 and July 31.

EPA's website for this pilot is at [WWW.EPA.GOV/Cleveland](http://WWW.EPA.GOV/Cleveland)

The Committee meeting adjourned at 9:00 PM.

**CLEVELAND AIR TOXICS WORKING GROUP**  
**DRAFT ACTION ITEMS**  
**28 June 2001**

- CBI will seek to revise groundrules given Working Group suggestions and distribute a redline-strikeout version of the revisions.
- CBI will communicate with members to ensure accurate contact information and to test dates for a July Working Group meeting.
- CBI will seek to contract suggested additions to Working Group membership and report back at the next meeting.
- An agenda planning committee consisting of Glen Landers, Paige Akins, Bob Leidich, and Jackie Gillon will meet via conference call to plan the next meeting's agenda with CBI and EPA.
- Members will review handouts from this meeting including the ICF Report and the Risk Reduction Activity tables.
- CBI will work with St. Clair Superior members to identify a location in that neighborhood for the next meeting.